

590 Madison Avenue, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10022-2524 • p212 223-4000 • f212 223-4134



Jeffrey W. Pagano  
(212) 895-4208  
jpagano@crowell.com

September 12, 2014

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Sandra J. Feuerstein  
United States District Judge  
United States District Court for  
the Eastern District of New York  
100 Federal Plaza  
Central Islip, New York 11722

**FILED**  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U S DISTRICT COURT E D N Y

★ SEP 15 2014 ★

**LONG ISLAND OFFICE**

**Re: Cecil Thomas et al. v. TXX Services, Inc. et al.  
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York  
Civil Action No. 2:13-CV-02789-SJF-SIL**

Dear District Judge Feuerstein:

We represent Defendants TXX Services, Inc. and Patricia Hunt (collectively, "Defendants") in connection with the above-referenced action. We write to request clarification from the Court with respect to the Court's September 10, 2014 Order terminating the docket entries for Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Dckt. No. 83), as well as Magistrate Judge Wall's Report and Recommendation (Dckt. No. 106) and Plaintiffs' September 8, 2014 Motion for Summary Judgment (Dckt. No. 124).

On October 3, 2013, Defendants filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, which was fully briefed and submitted to the Court pursuant to the Court's Individual Rule 4 on November 5, 2013. On June 24, 2014, the Court converted Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings to a Motion for Summary Judgment (*see* Dckt. No. 113). At the June 24, 2014 hearing, the Court specified that Defendants were not required to submit any additional papers in connection with the converted summary judgment motion, and that Plaintiffs would have an opportunity to provide supplemental information following the completion of a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition. Plaintiffs submitted their supplemental response and their own motion for summary judgment on September 8, 2014 (Dckt. No. 124).

The Court's September 10, 2014 Order does not address the merits of the motions for summary judgment and grants leave for the parties to renew them consistent with the Court's Individual Rule 4. In accordance with this Order, Defendants intend to re-file the briefs, declarations, and exhibits originally filed on November 5, 2013 as well as Plaintiffs'

The Honorable Sandra J. Feuerstein  
September 12, 2014  
Page 2

supplemental response (Dckt. No. 124), but docket them as documents related to a Motion for Summary Judgment rather than a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, complying with the "bundle rule" required by Individual Rule 4. Should the Court desire a different procedure under these circumstances, Defendants respectfully request guidance as to that procedure, in light of the Court's September 10, 2014 Order, in renewing their Motion for Summary Judgment.

If the Court prefers, counsel for Defendants can be available at the Court's convenience for a joint conference call to discuss the procedure for renewing the motions addressed by the Court's September 10, 2014 Order.

We thank the Court for its continued attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey W. Pagano

Jeffrey W. Pagano

cc (via ECF): Douglas Weiner, Esq.  
JOSEPH & KIRSCHENBAUM LLP  
223 Broadway, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10279  
facsimile: (212) 688-2548  
Counsel for Plaintiffs

Defendants, as movants, are to file the papers  
and any supplemental papers, as a motion for  
summary judgment, pursuant to the "bundle  
rule" set forth in Rule 4.  
So Ordered.

s/ Sandra J. Feuerstein

U.S.D. 9/15/14